

CALFED Bay-Delta Program Draft Summary of Public and Agency Comment May 13, 1996

Contents

Comments on Core Actions
Comments on Conveyance
 Isolated
 Other
Comments on Storage
Comments on Water Use Efficiency (formerly known as demand management)
Comments on Water Quality
Comments on Levee Stabilization and Emergency Response
Comments on Ecosystem Health
Comments on Process
Comments on Water Supply

Guide to Abbreviations

BAN:	Los Banos Public Meeting
BCH:	Long Beach Scoping Meeting
BK:	Bakersfield Scoping Meeting
F&G:	Department of Fish and Game
O:	Oakland Scoping Meeting
P:	Pasadena Scoping Meeting
RB:	Red Bluff Scoping Meeting
SAC:	Sacramento Scoping Meeting
SD:	San Diego Scoping Meeting
WS6:	Workshop Six
WG:	Walnut Grove Scoping Meeting

Other Useful Information

- ▶ Some comments that come from letters are preceded by numbers that indicate where the letter fell in the sequence of comment letters received.
- ▶ Some comments are followed by the name of the commenter.

Comments on Core Actions

Q: What is the difference between core and essential elements? Could you describe the essential elements, emphasizing how they are different from core actions?

A: A core action should be broadly acceptable, cost effective, and beneficial to program objectives. More specific criteria for distinguishing core actions can be found in the Appendix A - Core Actions Detail of the April Workshop 6 Information Packet. The term "essential elements" was suggested for a set of actions that was viewed by most to be essential to the success of any alternative and needed to be implemented at levels higher than those represented in the core actions. Essential elements should not be confused with the core actions since they are not subject to the same criteria. WS6

Q: Is it intended that core actions be implemented first, then essential elements?

A: Essential elements build on the core actions. Core actions tend to revolve around existing programs and essential elements take some of these actions a step further. WS6

Q: Some alternatives include core or essential elements at a higher implementation level; is that additive or do these actions include the core and essential elements?

A: The detailed alternative action descriptions add to the core and essential elements, however, in some instances the level of implementation is not clearly distinguished. WS6

Q: Some core actions are specific, others general. Habitat is very specific, water quality is more general. Why?

A: Where core actions are parts of existing programs, the ranges come from those programs. We were trying to respond to the many comments asking for numbers to be added to alternatives. WS6

Q: When will core action issues be resolved? There may be conflicts with elements in each alternative.

A: Our goal is to finish formulating core actions in Phase I, which is scheduled conclude this July. One of the criteria for determining whether an action is a "core action" is that it must not conflict with other elements of alternatives. WS6

Q: Core actions should be reviewed with consideration as to whether they are enough to make a difference. Are they adequate in scope to make a difference?

A: Core actions provide some progress toward a solution but do not represent a satisfactory solution by themselves. They provide potential for early implementation prior to completion of subsequent phases of the Program. WS6

Q: How and when will core actions be implemented?

A: These actions include things like habitat restoration projects, some of which are in progress

through other programs. Some overlap of staging will occur. In some cases, CALFED will be providing funding to projects that are in progress. Some of the CVPIA actions (e.g. Shasta temperature Control Device) are core actions and are currently happening. WS6

Q: Has it been determined that the core elements satisfy the solution principles?

A: Core actions meet criteria which distinguish them from other types of actions and in some instances these criteria mirror solution principles. They provide potential for early progress towards a solution, but do not satisfy solution principles by themselves. Please see Appendix A of the April Workshop 6 Information Packet for additional description of these criteria. WS6

Q: Why have the core actions excluded the Sierra watershed? If this included then more discussion of the Sierra is needed in the core actions.

A: Upstream watershed management is considered as an action of all the Alternatives. CALFED supports and intends to continue the support of existing programs. WS6

The concept of groundwater banking needs to be expanded in core action. WS6

Manage land uses to protect water quality. WS6

Core actions need to better address conjunctive use. WS6

If core actions and action elements go across the alternatives, then that is good information and it should influence the way we look at alternatives. We can go back and see how, why, where, and when the alternatives are influenced. The Core Actions are good as they stand. WS6

We should assume that the core actions are common. Lester said they may vary from alternative to alternative but we must assume that they stay constant. The primary issues to be dealt with are far different and more complex than those stemming from core actions. They provide a "false sense" to the alternatives. It is too soon to cast them in concrete. WS6

It's appropriate to have core actions but we shouldn't waste so much time and money. We should try Core Actions and Essential Elements in sequence so we can see if they work. WS6

It is too soon to get so specific. There is not enough science to back core actions up. We should see what the responses to them are. Regarding the pie charts, he likes the idea of identifying early wins. However, a sense of equity is currently missing due to disproportionate costs. He doesn't think we have moved forward equally. Their values are not necessarily tied proportionately to dollars. Need an indication of how goals improve with each objective. WS6

Core actions have not been discussed at length. They need to be discussed at a workshop that is separate from those on the individual alternatives. WS6

Implementation of Core Actions may differ for each alternative. Those differences are being lost in the discussions. They should be dealt with as part of the alternatives discussions as well as individually. Core actions may not be affordable as presented. ws6

Core actions have changed substantially. They are not simply core any more. They are too specific. ws6

Core actions are now too specific. They can't be supported by the information that has been made available.

R: The greater level of detail was provided in response to comments made at Workshop #5. The numbers provided demonstrate approximate sizes for many features of each alternative. The sizes are used only to illustrate the general concept for the draft alternative and should not be considered absolute. For instance, showing protection and enhancement of 4,000 to 6,000 acres of shallow water habitat at the most feasible sites with the highest value for aquatic habitat does not limit the final area to that range. After analysis in Phase II of the Program, this area could just as easily be 2,000 acres or 8,000 acres. ws6

They don't make sense unless the detail is the same across the board. Management of water quality could describe the specific level of contaminants coming out of the Delta.

R: Where core actions are parts of existing programs, the ranges come from those programs. Core actions generally enjoy broad support among stakeholders, however appropriate levels of TCMs and THMs are still debatable. ws6

Comments on Conveyance: Isolated

Does alt C use the Sacto ship canal? P

Does Alt J provide for releases into tributary streams? P

Alt J - 15,000-20,000cfs single diversion point - wouldn't it be same problem as putting all our diversion eggs in one basket?- wouldn't a multiple diversion site be a better choice so that there will back up - so that system could be operative if problem with the system in some other area. Have 3 separate 5,000 sites. P

Alameda Co : thru-Delta isolated facility for Water Quality. P

Alameda County Water District: Isolated facility relocates diversions out of the so Delta - eliminate or reduce sign the reverse stream flow problem into the Delta. Isolated facility meets all objectives. P

Q - Alt I use existing pumps? A - yes SD

Q- Chain of Lakes = isolated facility through center of Delta? Separate intake?

A- Yes,, chain of beads. Could incorporate multiple intakes for each island. SD

Eastside was part of original Central Valley Project but was dropped. Why? Provides opportunity to separate warm & cold water on Feather & Sac Rivers. Allows flexibility of diversions. SAC

Michael Jackson: Disturbed that 5 alts have Peripheral Canal. SAC

Four alts without peripheral canals & only two have upstream storage. RB

Alts H & I recognize physical limits at Tracy, why does J go beyond limits at Tracy. Is it 20,000 cfs all way to pumps? RB

Would alt J run at 15,000 cfs during water? RB

Label peripheral canal analogs as such. O

Is isolated conveyance at sea level? Only facility above sea level. Virtue of it would be being above sea level especially during EQ. A: Yes, majority of route. Protected against reasonably expected EQ & against flood. BCH

Would you mix two conveyances or isolated ag from drinking water. A: It's possible. Highest and best use water is drinking water. Will model. BCH

Does ALT J enhance water transfer opportunities more than others. A: Would enhance transfers. Many alternatives facilitate transfers. BCH

Evaluate validity of existing Delta bypass facilities when looking at reservoir re-op. These bypass facilities adversely affect Delta. BCH

Is this the p-canal or an isolated bypass, what% total flow will be taken out of the river. WG

This is the highest cfs to date, do you have the numbers. Didn't the voters reject this issue in 1982? A: Generally 15-20% into isolated facility during high flow times, similar to historical peripheral canal, but has fish screen. Similar but not the same. During low flow, unable to say. WG

Taking water around the Delta has the potential to devalue Delta lands by putting into questions our riparian and contractual water rights. It also may detract from water quality and quantity currently available to use. WG

Contra Costa Water District: Against large facilities that could degrade water quality and confuses fish. Leave enough water in Delta to protect Delta water quality. Through Delta facility will only work if you have significant reduction in pollutants. With isolated facility, could exchange with different east side entities to get water into Delta. Maybe buy water in SJ go get flows. But things too tight in SJ unless you release water from Friant. Only other way you can do it is to share this water you're getting out of the Sac River and putting it back somehow into S. Delta, but still have problem with fisheries. WG

I would feel terrible if you took water around the Delta to an isolated facility to grow crops to compete with us in the Delta. WG

Citizens for Safe Drinking Water oppose isolated transfer. Delta water quality will go down. WG

We are interested in Alternative I - the only alt that indicate how much water you want from the north, requires an isolated conveyance and the conveyance goes under the Delta and comes out of the westside. WG

If you have isolated facilities around the Delta, you would not address the need for regional flood control. At what level would channel capacity be maintained? Historically, channel were dredged, not it's impossible to get a permit. South fork is becoming a wonderful shallow habitat. If you take water around and don't have ability for us or someone to improve channel capacity, we're sunk in terms of flood control. WG

If you had isolated facility, who would particularly care to fund levee maintenance and emergency flood response? If you had an in-Delta system that transported water from north to south, I would see that the tax payers north and south would be selling to pay for levee stabilization and emergency response. WG

North/south conflicts over isolated facility. A: Trying to avoid old conflict. Won't solve problems. BK

Could the isolated facility be misused by the state and possible exterminate an endangered species? BK

96-111 The existing screens at the CVP and SWP intakes are inadequate. (F&G)

96-111 Windows for potential increases in exports need to be evaluated against impacts to all fish species. (F&G)

96-111 How will velocity through a screen at Hood be controlled without a pumped diversion? (F&G)

96-111 Entrainment losses associated with diversions into chain of lakes. (F&G)

96-111 Can an effective fish screen be constructed for a full isolated facility. (F&G)

96-111 The short list of alternatives should include the full range of export facility options. (F&G)

96-111 Reliance on existing export facilities will perpetuate current adverse conditions. (F&G)

96-111 Is it feasible to capture excess flows in upstream and south of the Delta facilities at the same time. (F&G)

96-111 Reduce exports from south Delta facilities to that which existed prior to the SWP and San Luis Project. Increase isolated facility size to approximately 10,000cfs. (F&G)

96-111 Can Chain of Lakes meet environmental water supply needs with a diversion of 10-15,000cfs? (F&G)

Comments on Conveyance: Other

Richard Denton: Through Delta facility good, need small isolated facility to meet drinking water needs, with storage to provide reliability. BK

Program: We hope that with better planning biological crises won't dictate water management. SD

What's the relationship to the increased Colorado River Water. Will taking more CR water help the Bay-Delta? SD

Program: CALFED assumes Colorado River aqueduct full. A new facility would reduce pressure on the Bay-Delta. SD

Alternatives should identify options for importing water from out of state e.g. flexible barges. Imperial Valley water. Transfers from Canada. Would be higher quality, so could be re-used several times due to low salinity levels. SD

Alternative A should be underlying premise, but need structural fix. SD

Alternative E seems to have most appeal as it doesn't push ag out of business and has a lot of things to offer, doesn't seem too expensive, possible to get support from more groups. SD

Do some alternatives have fewer or more objectives than others? SD

Friends of the River likes a combination of A & F. SAC

CUWA likes thru-Delta combined w/other elements. (More habitat, wider channels, moderate isolated facility.) SAC

League of Women Voters prefers nonstructural alternatives.

Noticed in none of the alternatives did I see plans to change or reoperate state pumps. Is it going to be part of the alts at all -- No serious problems with operation now? RB
is water going south. RB

Will the EIR determine what gets the water -- conveyance or habitat? RB

Rural Counties believe in lowest possible diversion, wrong to divert more water. SF and EBMUD should divers from Delta. Need more freshwater in central Delta. Alternatives don't address Bay flow needs. O

Do all the alternatives provide water above CVPIA flows? O

Evaluate impacts to reclamation sal intrusion and toxic due to not reconfiguring Delta. Purification more costly. BCH

Would alt E require engineering feasibility studies? Is the seismic activity severe there? BCH

Give serious consideration to a solution that includes through-Delta and isolated facility with storage for urban needs. BCH

Digging out s. Fork of Mokelumne w/ facilities north and south would be least expensive. WG

Many of proposed alternatives aren't going to work including p canal. Nobody will say how much water has to come out of the Sacramento River during the spring and summer. WG

Plumas County: We believe the Area of Origin Act, Delta Protection Act & Watershed of Origin Act means that can only take surplus water. Who would own an isolated facility? Build a dual system -- it makes no sense to mingle water. WG

Support high level of channel capacity improvements here in the Delta. WG

Program: We are aware of concept of common Delta pool and how to guarantee today the facility will be operated the way it was intended to in 40 years. WG

We like the channel improvements proposed. WG

Channel capacity is important -- 1986 flood cost us \$20-50 million. WG

One alternative to be recommended by CUWA will be modified through-Delta facility, widening some of the northern delta channels. Also recommend limited capacity isolated facility (location, size not specified). WG

Dredging is environmentally sound. WG

Screening of in-Delta diversions which are pumps and siphons would be costly, costs should be not paid by in-Delta users. Should be way to bypass screens if they plug up which would render siphons or pumps inoperative leading to costly crop losses because of nonoperation of diversion facilities. Farmers should be reimbursed for any such losses. WG

Contra Costa Water District: Setting levees back would increase conveyance. WG

Contra Costa Water District: Would need to increase conveyance in south Delta to make sure any water you are moving through the Delta can get down to the south area as well. WG

Would alt c be expandable and would water be dedicated to municipalities only? WG

In Alts C & G, are the pumps going to be operating at full levels and have you calculated the among of water to be taken out it both the is conveyance and the Delta pumps are operating at the same time? A: No we haven't. WG

Contra Costa supports thru-Delta alternative E--triple benefits of flood protection, ecosystem, conveyance. WG

If 30% of supply is for isolated facility, how would bromide be affected? A: Substantial improvement. Could get more urban drinking water from isolated facility because of better quality. BK.

Maricopa Storage District: Delta is an inefficient transport facility. CALFED mission could be interpreted to increase supply. BK

Decrease restrictions on moving water through the Delta. BK

Should consider reoperating all Delta projects. BK

Shift demand away from spring to summer/fall period. Water is needed to be redirected. BK